

RECEIVED
FEDERAL ELECTION
COMMISSION

2014 MAY 12 PM 2:43

OFFICE OF GENERAL
COUNSEL

Elizabeth B. Snedeker

Largo FL 33774

RECEIVED
2014 MAY 12 AM 10:00
FEC MAIL CENTER

May 1, 2014

Federal Election Commission

999 E. Street, N.W.

Washington, D.C. 20463

Dear Sirs:

I received in the mail today a notification of a complaint charging that I may have violated the Federal Election Campaign Act of 1971, as amended ("the Act"). The reference number of the complaint is MUR #6796.

The original date of this letter was March 20, 2014. Apparently a mistake in address caused it not to be delivered. It was mailed with the correct address on April 28, 2014. I have 15 days to reply. A conversation with Frankie D. Hampton of your office confirmed that we had 15 days from today (May 1, 2014) to respond.

First, the complaint alleges that I was treasurer of the Largo/Mid-Pinellas Democratic Club. This information was taken from the club's website dated July, 2011 (Exhibit A). This is factually wrong. I was not treasurer of the club at the time the House Majority PAC produced the ad in question. I have not been treasurer since Feb. 28, 2013.

Second, the complaint alleges that there was collaboration and coordination between me and the Sink Campaign in the production of this ad. My husband and I became involved in the production of the ad when we received a phone call from the President of the Largo/Mid-Pinellas Club saying that he had been asked to suggest the name of a couple who were older, on Social Security and articulate. We qualified on all three counts. He asked if we would be willing to be a part of an ad by the Congressional PAC on Social Security. We agreed and were interviewed by the producers and found acceptable. On February 11 we were interviewed on camera. Six hours of work was reduced to a thirty second ad for television. Throughout, the focus was on our attitudes towards Social Security. My husband and I have been concerned that Social Security not be privatized, not for our own benefits—no one was suggesting that—but for our children and grandchildren. The person we were opposing had offered to keep privatization as a possible solution. The ad, though brief, did convey that idea. At no time were

my husband nor I a part of any strategy meetings with any members of the Sink Campaign nor any members of the Largo/Mid-Pinellas Democratic Club regarding the purpose, content, and use of the ad. From our perspective and knowledge there was no collaboration or coordination between the Largo/Mid-Pinellas Democratic Club, the Sink Campaign and the Congressional PAC. The Club President served only as the means through which the Congressional PAC identified two citizens of Largo who felt strongly about Social Security.

I believe that no action should be taken against me, individually, or the Largo/Mid-Pinellas Democratic Club.

Yours truly,

Elizabeth B. Snedeker

Elizabeth B. Snedeker